

**Remarks**

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed May 28, 2008 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1, 11, 13 – 16, and 20 – 22. Claims 1 and 13 – 15 have been amended. Claims 2 – 10, 12, 17 – 19, and 23 – 45 have been cancelled.

**Claim Objections**

In Claim 1, the phrase “the content object including” has been amended to recite “the content object includes.” The claim status identifier “previously amended” has been changed to “previously presented.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 4 – 7, 9, and 11 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer, et. al. (U.S. 2003/0088520), in view of Kohane, et. al. (U.S. 2004/0199765). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“storing the content object in a federated content repository;  
storing the personal identification information of the author in a separate storage device from the federated content repository...”

Support for this amendment may be found in paragraphs [0002] and [0016]. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the documents of record teach or suggest storing the content object in a federated content repository and storing the personal identification information of the author in a separate storage device from the federated content repository as recited in the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“receiving a request for information by a collection function on a server;  
interrogating a plurality of content sources remote from the server by the collection function to retrieve information to satisfy the request;  
collecting the content object from a respective one of the plurality of content sources containing the content object in response to the content object being responsive to the request;

distributing the content object to a privacy function on the server; parsing the content object by the privacy function to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object in response to the content object being collected to satisfy the request, wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server and are accessed by a secure link...”

Applicant respectfully submits that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach or suggest these features of the present invention. For all of these reasons, Claim 1 as amended, is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Kohane, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 11 and 13 – 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer in view of Kohane, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Bohrer and Kohane. Additionally, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and by virtue of this dependency, include all of the features of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 11 and 13 – 14 are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Kohane, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Claims 15 – 16, 18, and 20 – 22, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer in view of Fahlman, et. al. (U.S. 5,960,080). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 15 has been amended to recite:

“collecting a content object responsive to a request by a collection function on a server, wherein the content object is stored in a federated content repository and personal identification information of an author of the content object is stored in a separate storage device from the federated content repository;

accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object, wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server...”

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Bohrer or Fahlman of the above recited features of the embodiment of the present invention in amended Claim 15. Accordingly, Claim 15 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Fahlman, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claim 15 is respectfully solicited.

With respect to Claims 16 and 20 – 22, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 15. Because of this dependency, these claims include all of the features of independent Claim 15. Therefore, Claims 20 – 22 are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Fahlman for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent Claim 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claims 16 and 20 – 22 is respectfully requested.

*Conclusion*

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-9434.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels, et al.  
(Applicant)

Date: July 9, 2008

By: 

Charles L. Moore  
Registration No. 33,742  
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, N.C. 27560  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199